

REMARKS:

Claims 1-10, 17-21, 23-25, and 28-33 (Group I claims) were presented for examination in view of a Restriction Requirement dated November 4, 2004 and were pending in this application. Group II claims (12-16, 22, and 26-27) were not elected and cancelled without prejudice. In the first paragraph of the Office action dated April 3, 2004, Examiner notes that claims 1-16, 22, and 26-27 were withdrawn from consideration pursuant to the Restriction Requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that there is a typographical error with respect to the claims noted and that claim 1-16 should be claims 12-16. As claims 1 through 10 were examined, Applicant responds to the Office action under the assumption that Examiner intended to note claims 12-16 rather than claims 1-16.

In the Office action, claims 1-10, 24, 29, 31, and 32 were allowed, claims 17-21 were objected to, and claims 23, 25, 28, and 30 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address Examiner's comments below.

Applicants herein add new claims 34-38. Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 34 generally corresponds with objected to claim 19. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 should be allowable. In addition, claims 35-38 depend from claim 34 and also should be allowable.

Applicants herein amend claims 23, 25, 28, and 30. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. The claims have been amended to expedite the prosecution of the application in a manner consistent with the Patent Office Business Goals, 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000). In making these amendments, Applicants have not and do not concede that the subject matter of such claims was in fact

disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seek to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)

In the second and third paragraphs of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 23, 25, 28, and 30 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,605,505 to Han ("Han"). This rejection is traversed.

Representative claim 23 recites, inter alia, the following:

...
communicating the formatted input capture data to the pre-existing host system, the pre-existing host system without an active device driver corresponding to the first cordless device and without modifications to hardware of the pre-existing host system corresponding to the first cordless device.

Among the benefits of the claimed invention is that a wireless (or composite) device communicates with a pre-existing host system without the need for an active device driver on the host system and without having to modify hardware of the host system to accommodate the devices. Hence, the claimed invention allow for greater flexibility in pairing wireless devices with pre-existing host systems because there is no need for specific drivers or hardware modifications on the host systems for each wireless device seeking to interoperate with that host system.

The cited reference, Han, does not disclose the claimed invention and is altogether a different configuration than the claimed invention. Han discloses:

A two-player game playing apparatus using wireless remote controllers includes a first remote controller, a second remote controller, a first remote control signal receiver for receiving a game key signal transmitted from the first remote controller, a second remote control signal receiver for receiving the game key signal transmitted from the second remote controller, a decoder, a game pack, a game processor, and a video outputting apparatus, thereby allowing two players to enjoy a game with wireless remote controllers.

Han, Abstract. The game apparatus in Han is specifically configured for operation with the wireless remote controllers that are associated with it.

The game processor 16 shown in Figure 2 of Han is a specialized processor that interfaces with the wireless game controllers 11, 12 through the decoder 15. (*Han*, col. 2, line 37 to col. 3, line 30). The decoder 15 and game processor 16 are integrated with the wireless devices 11, 12 and if any of the three components were removed from the system it would be render the system and components inoperable. The custom nature of this system configuration is a result of modified hardware and software to allow for game system operations. In turn, Han fails to disclose “the formatted input capture data to the pre-existing host system, the pre-existing host system without an active device driver corresponding to the first cordless device and without modifications to hardware of the pre-existing host system corresponding to the first cordless device” as is claimed by Applicants.

As is well established, in a rejection under 35 USC §102, each and every claim element must be present in the applied reference. In this case, the Han reference fails to disclose “the formatted input capture data to the pre-existing host system, the pre-existing host system without an active device driver corresponding to the first cordless device and without modifications to hardware of the pre-existing host system corresponding to the first

cordless device.” Thus, based on the Remarks herein, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons claims 23, 25, 28, and 30 (and appropriate dependent claims 17-21) are patentably distinguishable over Han. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 17-21, 23, 25, 28, and 30, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

Applicants further submit that new claims 34-38 are supported by the specification and are commensurate within the scope of protection to which Applicants believe they are entitled. Therefore, Applicants request allowance of these claims as well.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants’ representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
ROLF AMBUEHL, ET AL.

Date: July 5, 2005

By: _____



Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200